

Appl. No. : 10/508,969
Filed : April 8, 2005

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the invention. Support for "configured to be used in a printing paper ..." can be found on page 6, lines 3-7, for example. Support for "a positive potential" and "a negative potential" can be found on page 3, lines 22-29, for example. Support for "amphoteric" can be found in the description of polyacrylamide described on page 3, lines 5-12, the definition of polyacrylamide described on page 3, lines 22-29, and the calculation methods described on page 6, line 13 through page 7, line 4, for example. Support for "blended in" can be found on page 5, lines 6-7 and the Examples on pages 9-14, for example. Claims 9-14 have been added. Support for claim 9 can be found on page 5, lines 4-5, for example. Support for claim 10 can be found on 5, lines 6-8, for example. Support for claims 11-14 can be found on page 3, line 30 through page 4, line 17, for example.

The specification has been amended to correct a clerical error. "Polyacrylamides" should be "The polyacrylamides" because the paragraph describes the polyacrylamides used in the present invention, not polyacrylamides in general.

No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Vinson (5958185). Claim 1 is independent and has been amended to clarify the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner asserts that Vinson discloses a high bulk tissue paper comprising cationic polyacrylamide with a maximum charge density at any pH of 0.2 to 2.5 meq/g. As the Examiner admits, the polyacrylamide taught by Vinson is cationic polyacrylamide.

In contrast, the polyacrylamide is a specific amphoteric polyacrylamide which has "in the same molecule both anionic groups, the representative of which are carboxyl groups, and cationic groups, the representative of which are tertiary amine and/or quaterary ammonium cation groups, and whose electric charge is 2.0 m-equivalent/g or less at pH 2 and also 2.0 m-equivalent/g or less at pH 12" (the electric charge at each pH level indicates the differential quantity between cationic groups and anionic groups that are active at that pH level). (Page 3, lines 22-27) The

Appl. No. : **10/508,969**
Filed : **April 8, 2005**

polyacrylamide exhibits “a positive potential at pH 2 where cationic groups are more active, and a negative potential at pH 12 where anionic groups are more active.” (Page 3, lines 27-29) The polyacrylamide improves the paper strength of a bulky paper without affecting its density and also causes the paper to manifest good optical characteristics contain both anionic groups and cationic groups in small quantities. (Page 3, lines 5-7) Also see the Examples on page 9-15.

Vinson does not teach or even suggest the polyacrylamide recited in claim 1. At least for this reason, Vinson could not anticipate claim 1.

Further, as the Examiner admits, Vinson teaches tissue paper. In contrast, the paper recited in claim 1 is a bulky paper which is configured to be used in a printing paper, a recording paper, or a base paper for art paper, cast coated paper or high-grade coated paper, and which clearly requires paper strength and density different from tissue paper. Tissue paper and the bulky paper recited in the claims are entirely different papers in the art. For this additional reason, Vinson could not anticipate claim 1.

In view of the above, claim 1 could not be anticipated by Vinson, and at least for this reason, the remaining dependent claims also could not be anticipated by Vinson. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jewell (6306251). Claim 1 is independent and has been amended to clarify the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner asserts that Jewell discloses a tissue paper having increased bulk that comprises polyacrylamide, and since the polyacrylamide is not cationic or anionic, it inherently has a charge density less than 2.0 meq/g. As mentioned in the present specification, “[p]olyacrylamides and starches are two of the representative types of paper-strengthening agents that are widely used today.” (Page 2, lines 1-2) Thus, the use of “polyacrylamide” in general is not new. It is well settled that the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) Thus, the Examiner could not establish an anticipation of a specific amphoteric polyacrylamide which has an electric charge of 2.0 m-equivalent/g or less and a

Appl. No. : **10/508,969**
Filed : **April 8, 2005**

positive potential at pH 2 and has an electric charge of 2.0 m-equivalent/g or less and a negative potential at pH 12 (as set forth in claim 1 as amended herein), based on the mere disclosure of "polyacrylamide". Further, Jewell does not teach that polyacrylamide improves the paper strength of a bulky paper without affecting its density. Thus, at least for the above reason, Jewell could not anticipate claim 1.

Further, the Examiner is in error in asserting that Jewell discloses a tissue paper. Jewell teaches a multi-ply paperboard (e.g., col. 2, lines 35-46). In any case, the multi-ply paperboard and the bulky paper recited in the claims are entirely different in the art. For this additional reason, Jewell could not anticipate claim 1.

In view of the above, claim 1 could not be anticipated by Jewell, and at least for this reason, the remaining dependent claims also could not be anticipated by Jewell. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

New claims

Claims 9-14 have been added. These claims depend ultimately from claim 1, and thus, at least for this reason, these claims could not be anticipated by the prior art of record.

Appl. No. : 10/508,969
Filed : April 8, 2005

CONCLUSION

In light of the Applicant's amendments to the claims and the foregoing Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns which might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: July 6, 2006

By:



Katsuhiro Arai

Registration No. 43,315

Attorney of Record

Customer No. 20,995

(949) 760-0404

2726556_1
070606